



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/617,441	07/14/2000	HIROTAKA KAWATA	106310	5358

25944 7590 03/14/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

BROCK II, PAUL E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/617,441

Applicant(s)

KAWATA, HIROTAKA

Examiner

Paul E Brock II

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 20 August 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There is no support in the specification for the claim terminology “a plurality of transistors disposed correspondingly to intersections between the data line and the scanning line” and “the channel region having a semiconductor portion protruding out of the channel region.”

### ***Drawings***

2. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on August 20, 2002. These drawings are approved.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “a plurality of transistors disposed correspondingly to intersections between the data line and the scanning line” and “the channel region having a semiconductor portion protruding out of the channel region,” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1 – 8 and 20 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It is not clear where there is support for “a plurality of transistors disposed correspondingly to intersections between the data line and the scanning line,” and “the channel region having a semiconductor portion protruding out of the channel region,” in the originally filed specification.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1 – 7, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. In claim 1, the claim limitation how “a plurality of transistors disposed correspondingly to intersections between the data line and the scanning line” it is not clear how the data line, which is disclosed as a straight line, and the scanning line, which is also disclosed as a straight line, can have more than one intersection. For purposes of this office action “a plurality of

transistors disposed correspondingly to intersections between the data line and the scanning line” will be considered -- a transistor disposed correspondingly to an intersection between the data line and the scanning line --.

9. Further, in claim 1, the claim limitation “the channel region having a semiconductor portion protruding out of the channel region,” is not clear. How can a region have a portion extending outside of itself? If the semiconductor portion of the channel region is still the channel region, than it cannot extend outside of the channel region.

10. It is not clear in claim 1 if the second recitation of “a contact hole” on line 10 is referring to the same “a contact hole” as recited on line 9. For purposes of this office action the recitation of “a contact hole” on line 10 will be considered -- a second contact hole --.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1, 3 – 7, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakazawa et al. (USPAT 5614730, Nakazawa).

With regard to claim 1, Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 an electro-optical device. Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 a substrate (109). Nakazawa discloses

Art Unit: 2815

in figures 19a – 19c and 20 a pixel electrode. Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 a scanning line (101). Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 a data line (108) crossing the scanning line. Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 a plurality of transistors disposed correspondingly to intersections between the data line and the scanning line. Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 a gate electrode (103). As far as the examiner can ascertain, Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 a semiconductor (102) layer, wherein the semiconductor layer comprises a source region (enlarged part of the semiconductor layer to the right of the gate electrode) that is connected to the pixel electrode through a contact hole (1905), a drain region (enlarged part of the semiconductor region to the left of the gate electrode) that is connected to the data line through a contact hole (1906), a channel region (portion of 102 directly under gate electrode) disposed under the gate electrode, and the channel region having a semiconductor portion protruding out of the channel region and not being covered with the gate electrode.

With regard to claim 3, Nakazawa discloses in column 4, lines 3 – 12 the semiconductor region forming the transistor comprises polycrystalline silicon.

With regard to claim 4, Nakazawa discloses in column 3, line 57 the substrate being an insulative substance.

With regard to claim 5, Nakazawa discloses in column 3, line 57 the substrate being an quartz substrate.

With regard to claim 6, Nakazawa discloses in column 3, line 57 the substrate being an glass substrate.

With regard to claim 7, Nakazawa discloses in figure 23b a second substrate (313) disposed opposing a surface of the first substrate. Nakazawa discloses in figure 23b liquid crystals (312) sandwiched by the first substrate and the second substrate, and driven by transistor elements formed on the semiconductor layers.

With regard to claim 20, as far as the examiner can ascertain, Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 the semiconductor portions protrudes in a direction in which the scanning line extends.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakazawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (USPAT 5316960, Watanabe).

Nakazawa does not disclose the semiconductor region forming the transistor comprises monocrystalline silicon. Watanabe teaches in column 4, lines 22 – 26 that monocrystalline silicon is a well known material with which to form a semiconductor region. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use monocrystalline silicon of Watanabe as the semiconductor for the transistor of Nakazawa in order to select a layer with desired channel characteristics.

Art Unit: 2815

15. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakazawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of one of ordinary skill in the art.

It has been held in *In re Pearson* 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA) that intended use does not avoid prior art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the device of claim 1 as an LCD projector.

16. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakazawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nishihara et al. (JPPAT 06163891, Nishihara).

Nakazawa discloses in figures 19a – 19c and 20 wherein the gate electrode has two parts protruding out of the semiconductor layer. Nakazawa does not teach that the source or drain region is disposed between the two parts of the gate electrode protruding out of the semiconductor layer. Nishihara teaches in figures 3 and 4 a gate electrode (11) having two parts (part below a semiconductor layer, and the part to the above left of the semiconductor layer) protruding out of a semiconductor layer, and the drain (14a) being disposed between the two parts. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the two parts of the gate electrodes of Nishihara in the device of Nakazawa in order to reduce the mounting area as stated in the abstract of Nishihara.



***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments filed January 31, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

18. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a semiconductor portion that protrudes out of the gate electrode) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Conclusion***

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2815

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E Brock II whose telephone number is (703)308-6236. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703)308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Paul E Brock II  
March 10, 2003



**EDDIE LEE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**